DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 146 SP 005 004

AUTHOR Grotelueschen, Arden D.; Storm, Gary A.
TITLE The National TTT Program: Noteworthy Activities and Outcomes. Aperiodic Report: Trainers of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Evaluation. No. 3.
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
PUB DATE Oct 70
NOTE 93p.; Submitted to Consortium of Professional Associations for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty, Program Descriptions, *Program Evaluation, *Program Improvement, *Teacher Education, *Teacher Educator Education, *Teacher Educators

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes information about TTT projects collected during telephone interviews with directors of TTT projects re-funded for fiscal year 1970-71. It is intended to be useful to various groups in describing, justifying, and planning for the national TTT program. A structured telephone interview was used and a copy of the interview schedule is included in an appendix. The areas covered were 1) project directors and project settings; 2) goals and descriptions of most successful components--human resources (the central administrative staff, the instructional staff, participants, parity groups) and financial resources; (3) activities and outcomes of most successful components--structure and activities of advisory committees, decision making, cooperative working arrangements, curriculum, and communication patterns; (4) least successful components--problems encountered, and ideas for problem solutions; and 5) general assessment of program. Most directors had concrete suggestions for improving the program, but almost all were very satisfied with the responsiveness of the national program administrators to suggestions for change and were optimistic that the program would be able to improve its effectiveness in the future. [ED 041 832 is a related document.] (MBM)

ED052146

APERIODIC REPORT: TRAINERS OF TEACHER TRAINERS (TTT) EVALUATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NO. 3

THE NATIONAL TTT PROGRAM: NOTEWORTHY ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES

October 1970

A description of the National TTT Program based on project directors' assessment of various aspects of project components.

Submitted to CONSORTIUM OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS for Study of Special Teacher Improvement Programs

Arden D. Grotelueschen and Gary A. Storm
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
(CIRCE)
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801
Telephone: (217) 333-3771

SP005004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Purpose	1
Methodology	2
Results	6
Project Directors and Project Settings	6
Goals and Descriptions of Most Successful Components	10
Inputs of Most Successful Components	15
Human Resources	16
The Central Administrative Staff (CAS)	16
The Instructional Staff	18
Participants (Students, Learners)	19
Parity Groups	22
Financial Resources	26
Activities and Outcomes of Most Successful Components	31
Structure and Activities of Advisory Committees	32
Decision-making	35
Cooperative Working Arrangements	36
Curriculum	41
Communication Patterns	46
Least Successful Components	48
Problems Encountered	48
Ideas for Problem Solutions	49
General Assessment of Program	51
Appendix A: 1969-70 TTT Project Director Phone Interview Schedule	
Appendix B: Interviewee Roster	

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to summarize information about TTT projects collected during telephone interviews with directors of TTT projects refunded for fiscal year 1970-71. The summarized information is intended to be useful to various groups in describing, justifying, and planning for the National TTT Program. The primary groups--or "audiences"--to which this evaluation is directed are the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, TTT Branch (BEPD-TTT), and the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (USOE-HEW). The report should be useful to BEPD-TTT in describing the goals, activities, and accomplishments of the National TTT Program to USOE, HEW, Congress, and the current Administration. The report should be useful to USOE-HEW primarily as a means for communicating the effectiveness of the National TTT Program.

Other groups to whom the report should be useful include CONPASS, project directors, cluster directors, advisory boards, and the Leadership Training Institute (LTI-TTT). The report should allow CONPASS to ascertain the involvement of liberal arts in the National TTT Program; it should allow project directors to better view their project's role; it should allow cluster directors to gain ideas that would be useful for training and evaluation; it should allow advisory committees to gain a deeper insight into the National TTT Program and provide them with a better basis for constructively criticizing and making suggestions to improve their projects; and finally it should allow LTI-TTT to better

serve its primary function of training "on a long-term basis a cadre of project directors who, in turn, will design and direct projects of excellence in particular program areas both in terms of efficiency and effectiveness."[1]

METHODOLOGY

The "structured telephone interview" was used to collect the information summarized in this report. Originally, CIRCE's evaluation personnel had planned to visit all or most of the TTT projects refunded for fiscal year 1970-71 in order to observe operations, interview TTT staff members and representatives of each of the parity groups, and look through records and documents. But the LTI site visitations in early winter and again in late spring forced a change in plans. The CIRCE staff believed that a site visitation by CIRCE personnel would have been too much of a burden on local project personnel; thus it was decided to use structured telephone interviews as a substitute means for compiling the "profile" of the National TTT Program.

By deciding to gather data by conducting telephone interviews with project directors, as opposed to site visits of projects, the evaluators no doubt sacrificed some fullness of description: descriptions and judgments collected were limited to the project directors' viewpoints and impressions. Nevertheless, these viewpoints are probably the most

---

[1]From position statement of Leadership Training Institute issued by Russell Wood, Deputy Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Fducational Personnel Development, USOE, January 31, 1969.

informed single source of data regarding the activities and outcomes of TTT projects.

To ensure that the information obtained from the project directors would be complete, the evaluators specified descriptive criteria to guide the information gathering process. Such a procedure does not guarantee that everything that occurs in the project (or in whatever setting is being observed) will be described, but it does ease the task of determining whether specific phenomena of interest are occurring. The evaluators attempted to maximize information obtained from the telephone interview by "structuring" it, by asking questions which called for specific, concrete, usually descriptive information from project directors. The major task in developing the interview was deciding what specific kinds of information should be collected.

The evaluators decided early that after collecting some biographical data on the project directors and some information about project settings, it would be desirable to have project directors identify the major "components" of their projects and then to select the component they considered "most successful" to talk about in more detail.[2] "Components" were defined as "those salient features or basic elements around which a project is organized. These features may involve subject matter, methods, or clients. They serve as a means of communicating to others what a project is about." After answering detailed questions about the project component they considered most successful, project

---

[2]In cases where project directors could not identify any one component as "most successful," they usually selected a component that they considered "most unique" relative to other TTT project activities.

directors were asked a few brief questions about the component they considered least successful. The interview ended with a "final word" from the director: he was given a chance to express any ideas (criticisms, suggestions for improvement) or feelings he had about any aspect of the National TTT Program. Appendix A contains a copy of the interview schedule.

The rationale for having project directors identify, describe, and to a certain extent evaluate the "most successful" and "least successful" components of their projects was to make it possible for groups outside particular projects (including other project directors) to note "what TTT projects are doing best" and "what special problems projects of this sort often encounter." The evaluators believed that information of this sort would be more useful to the groups being served by the evaluation than would less detailed information about more aspects (components) of the projects. But perhaps more important, detailed comments about one or two project components allowed the evaluators to collect rather specific information about inputs, activities, and outcomes associated with TTT project operations which, in turn, would provide a profile of the National TTT Program. Of particular interest in this regard were activities and outcomes (especially where they involved "institutional change") in areas like decision-making, activities of advisory boards, cooperative working arrangements inside and outside the university environment, and curriculum. Given the constraints of time that the evaluators' set for themselves--the interviews were designed to take approximately one hour to administer--this was the kind of information they believed most valuable to collect.

The information summarized in this report is presented in approximately the same order that it was collected during the interviews. As can be seen in the Table of Contents, the areas covered (in order) are Project Directors and Project Settings; Goals and Descriptions of Most Successful Components; Inputs of Most Successful Components (human resources, financial resources); Activities and Outcomes of Most Successful Components (structure and activities of advisory committee, decision making, cooperative working arrangements, curriculum, communication patterns); Least Successful Components (problems encountered, ideas for problem solution); and General Assessment of Program.

A word should yet be said about the actual conduct of the telephone interviews and the method of analysis of responses. The interviews, each of which averaged 65 minutes, were conducted by three members of the TTT evaluation team from CIRCE: Arden Grotelueschen, Margaret Pjojian and Gary Storm. Only the directors of those 38 projects which were refunded for fiscal year 1970-71 were included in the telephone survey. All interviews (except one not completed) occurred during the months of May and June 1970. In a few instances, a project director was unavailable so his designated alternate, another member of the project's administrative staff, was interviewed. Appendix B provides a list of the interviewees with their institutional affiliation.

Immediately before each interview, the interviewer reacquainted himself with the project's abstract and other relevant information in the project file. At the beginning of the phone call, the respondent was assured of the anonymity of his responses so that he would (hopefully) feel free to express himself truthfully. The interviewer recorded

responses manually during the interview. Immediately after the termination of the phone call, the interviewer edited the recorded responses and made sure that all items with precoded responses were completed. Finally, the interviewer sent a card to the interviewee thanking him for his cooperation.

When all the interviews were finished, the responses to the items in the interview schedule were summarized. Precoded responses to items were tallied and percentages for each response type were computed. Responses to open-ended items were "inductively classified"[3] and were also summarized in raw and percentage form.

RESULTS

Project Directors and Project Settings

It is important to describe briefly those persons interviewed to provide the reader with perspective on the source of data for this report. In addition, the description of project directors provides important information about the National TTT Program, since project directors are responsible for implementing the Program at the local level.

Although it is somewhat misleading to describe a group in terms of an "average" member based upon an analysis of the "mean" characteristics

[3]The technique of inductive classification was used to post-code responses to items for which the interviewee was not given specified alternatives. Basically, this technique involves classifying responses to open-ended items in terms of categories the coder constructs after reading each individual's answer to a given item. A list with response categories numbered and arranged in descending order of frequency is thus obtained, and responses to each person are then coded with the number of the appropriate category.

of the group as a whole, the procedure is nonetheless helpful in conveying a general sense of what the group is like. According to the results of the telephone interview, a "typical" project director is male and received a doctorate in education from a well-known private institution (e.g., Stanford, Teachers College) approximately 13 years ago. He typically assumed leadership for obtaining TTT funds prior to the initial funding of his project and became project director sometime during the first half of 1969. In addition to being a project director, he is now a tenured full or associate professor in education and has been for three to five years. There is about a fifty-fifty chance that someone co-directs the project with him, either formally or informally.

As was expected, project directors showed more variation on some background dimensions than on others. One of the first conclusions that the data suggest is that university people, and professional educators in particular, seem to dominate positions of leadership in the TTT Program. Eighty-six percent of the project directors interviewed received degrees in disciplines affiliated with education; only five directors (14%) received degrees in other academic areas: two in history, two in English, and one in agricultural economics. Project directors showed very little variation on "highest degree held." Eleven percent of the directors had a master's degree as their highest degree and the remaining 89 percent held a doctorate, either Ph.D. (43%) or Ed.D. (46%).

Other than the title of TTT Project Director, only four directors held titles not associated with a college or university faculty position. One of these directors was an assistant principal in a junior high school

and the other three had positions in state education departments (Assistant to State Superintendent, Director of Social Studies for the State, and staff member on the State Commission on Education). All of the remaining directors interviewed had university positions as assistant, associate, or full professors; college deans (or assistant or associate deans); or department chairmen. The vast majority of these university people were affiliated with colleges of education.

Further evidence of the domination of university and college people in positions of leadership in TTT is provided by the fact that 86 percent of the projects were reported to be administered from a college or university. Of these projects 57 percent were administered out of colleges of education and 20 percent were administered from colleges of liberal arts. Only five project directors (14%) indicated that their projects were administered outside of a college or university. Two were administered from state education departments, two from public school systems, and one from a state agency other than the education department.

As can readily be seen, the original intent of TTT planners to bring liberal arts, and later, public school and community people into positions of influence in TTT projects is not reflected in the background data on project directors and the settings in which projects are housed. Professional educators continue to dominate leadership in TTT. It is not surprising that this "education bias" exists at the present time, however, given the facts that (a) the TTT Program is quite new, (b) channels of communication between USOE and colleges of education that existed

prior to the inception of TTT were used extensively in getting the Program started, and (c) educators, more than any other group, were aware of USOE concerns and priorities and were equipped to respond with project proposals to new funds made available by the Office. Whether or not this education bias will continue to exist, and whether or not it has affected (or will affect) the achievement of goals concerning parity in project planning and operation are questions that later data will have to answer.

The interview results which show that approximately two-thirds of the project directors assumed leadership prior to TTT funding seem to indicate that program leadership was considerably stable in its initial stages. Many of the directors who had not assumed leadership prior to funding had been involved in some aspect of planning and proposal writing and thus were quite familiar with project programs before assuming their directorships.

The fact that directors completed their degree work an average of 13 years ago could be taken as evidence that TTT leaders are experienced and mature educators, familiar with university procedures and policies. Whether this statistic indicates familiarity with school-university, community-school, or community-school-university problems and working relationships is another question. Not many project directors have academic credits which indicate such familarity. Given the fact that the TTT Program is focused on problems and relationships of the latter sort as they bear on teacher training, it might be argued that having more project directors from the ranks of school and community people,

or who have been formally trained (or have had extensive experience) in educational sociology or community-school relations, would be preferable to the present situation.

It is encouraging to note, however, that in all but a very few cases TTT project directors are "working directors"--there are only a few directors who might be considered "figureheads" only. This means, among other things, that project directors represent real, active, and effective forces in the TTT Program. As such, they must share a large burden of the responsibility for the Program's success or failure. Given the motivation to work toward TTT objectives and an ability to bring appropriate groups together, project directors can help achieve much for the Program; lacking such motivation and ability, they can deter progress significantly. The key and active role of project directors in TTT would seem to indicate that training sessions aimed to improve the Program could well be designed around this group.

Goals and Descriptions of Most Successful Components

Due to the openness of the question in which project directors were asked to list all major components of their projects,[4] responses to the question were varied and were expressed at different levels of generality. For the most part, respondents identified the major components in terms of the purposes of the components and the people the components were

[4]"Components," it will be recalled, were defined as "those salient features or basic elements around which a project is organized. These features may involve subject matter, methods, or clients. They serve as a means of communicating to others what a project is about."

designed to serve. Although on the surface the components appear to be rather traditional in focus and procedure (e.g., masters and doctoral degree programs in teacher education, laboratory experience for teacher training, new foundations course for prospective teachers), later more precise descriptions of their goals and activities will show that many of these components are quite innovative.

What does the evalution data tell us about those components identified by project directors as "most successful?" Generally, these components are operational (as opposed to "planning" or "pilot") in nature, have participants (students, learners) associated with them, and are concerned with teacher training at the TT or TTT level that focuses on the problems of educating the disadvantaged in elementary and secondary schools. Almost all of these components will be continued next year (FY 70-71) and will receive either approximately the same or greater emphasis than they have this year. The purposes of these components have seldom changed since their conception, and project directors are generally very pleased with the progress made toward their achievement to date.

A more detailed look at these dimensions of "most successful" components shows that 59 percent of the components were "operational" during FY 69-70, while 22 percent were in the "planning" and 16 percent were in the "pilot" stage.[5] Eighty-nine percent of the components had participants associated with them; 8 percent did not. The vast majority

[5]Wherever percentages do not add up to 100 percent, it is because there were one or more "no response" items.

of participants involved were at the in-service/post graduate level or higher. In descending order of frequency, participants were working at the following educational levels: Doctoral, Masters, In-service/post graduate, Postdoctoral, Preservice/undergraduate, High School and Paraprofessional. As far as backgrounds of participants are concerned, most participants were (again in descending order of frequency) public school teachers, public school supervisors, education faculty members, liberal arts faculty members, and community people. About one-half of the components had participants that were from different racial backgrounds. Approximately an equal number of components had participants that were primarily in their mid- to late-twenties as had participants that were widely varied in age. As reflected in the "successful components," these statistics seem to show that TTT is in fact concentrating its efforts at educational reform on people who are concerned with teacher training at the higher education level--as it originally intended to do--and that it is succeeding fairly well at involving racially mixed groups of people as project participants. Further evidence in support of the first point is provided by project directors' responses to the question, "What level of training benefits most from this most successful component?" All but seven directors indicated that the second (TT) or third (TTT) level of training benefited most directly from the activities of these components.

In identifying the "target populations" at which their most successful components were directed, project directors indicated that "inner city" and "disadvantaged" youth were definitely the major focus of concern.

Only eight directors (22 percent of those interviewed) did not identify one of these two groups as the major target population of their most successful components. Of these eight, seven identified "surburban youth" or "ordinary classrooms" as the chief target population of these components; and one identified "social studies teachers and school administrators." Among the groups that directors included in the category of "disadvantaged youth" were Indian youth, Negro youth, Spanish-American youth, rural youth, and youth from multi-ethnic classrooms. It would be difficult to find stronger evidence than these statistics that TTT has been successful at focusing its program on the educational problems of "disadvantaged" sectors of the population.

The only "most successful component" to be discontinued during FY 70-71 is one that has encountered problems because "desegregation orders have changed school conditions". Of the remaining 36 such components, 15 will be given greater emphasis during FY 70-71 than they received in FY 69-70, 15 will receive about the same emphasis, and 3 will receive less emphasis. Among typical reasons for giving more emphasis to certain successful components next year were "our structure is now established and we can devote more time to the actual program," "we will be operational and more people will be involved," "we spread ourselves too thin this last year," "we had to make a long-term commitment to our pilot school," "our home institution has increased its support next year," and "there has been a redistribution of emphasis within TTT Program." Only one of the three project directors who indicated that their most successful components would be de-emphasized next year did so because of a

cutback in funds from USOE. The other two did so because the "project is established and local institutions are taking over sponsorship of the program" (Washington State Department of Public Instruction, Pilot Project in counselor education) and "the project has been successful so we will now emphasize another component" (Clark University, degree programs in history, geography, and economics).

When project directors were asked to describe briefly "the single major goal" of their most successful project components, many of them (approximately 50%) replied with something like, "to improve T, TT, or TTT curriculum instruction." As was true in project directors' responses to the first question of this section (pertaining to the description of project components), this kind of a response is much too general to indicate the innovative versus traditional quality of the goal. Some of the other goals that project directors mentioned frequently were not so abstract and could be assessed as fairly innovative in nature. In descending order of frequency, the goals most often mentioned by project directors were: (a) to improve T, TT, or TTT curriculum instruction, (b) to promote relevancy in teaching . . . and to implement it, (c) to promote understanding of problems of bilingual and bicultural children, (d) to establish trainers in the schools, (e) to improve instruction at the college level, and (f) to orient Ph.D. candidates to teacher training as well as research.[6] Besides being fairly innovative, these goals

[6]Other goals mentioned by project directors included: to help schools provide their own in-service training; to change authority relations in public schools; to free children to realize their potential; to foster individualized classrooms; to better understand relations between learning, content, and teaching; to change accredited programs; to recruit TT personnel for TTT work; and to train clinical supervisory personnel.

seem to embody more than an average degree of concern for "social relevancy" in teacher training programs.

Only five project directors indicated that the purposes or goals of their most successful components had changed since they were conceived. Four of these directors said the purposes of the components were "somewhat different" now; the other stated that the purposes of his most successful component were "greatly different" than they had been originally. In discussing ways that the purposes of their most successful components had changed, the five directors listed: "efforts to include more community people," "review of the basis for selecting participants," "addition of new content areas in curriculum associated with the component," "change in target population: new focus on inner city," and "creation of new 'field coordinators' to promote in-service education."

Ten percent of the project directors interviewed believed that the present purposes of their most successful components were "fully" achieved, another 65 percent believed they were "substantially" achieved, and another 12 percent said that they were "somewhat" achieved. This indicates that project directors themselves--key figures in the operation and success of the TTT Program--are encouraged by, and optimistic about, the rate of progress being made in a key aspect of TTT projects.

Inputs of Most Successful Components

In this section of the telephone interview, the evaluators were concerned with collecting information on the "resources," human and

financial, used in operating a project's most successful component. Included in the category "human resources" were a project's central administrative staff (the director and those people working immediately around him), instructional staff, participants (students, learners), and representatives from the various parity groups. In the area of "financial resources," information was collected about USOE funding (amount and timing of funds and adjustments required) and funding from other sources (home institution, community, schools, state and other agencies). Evaluators collected this information on human and financial resources because they believed that the extent to which the stated purpose of a project component is achieved depends greatly upon the adequacy of these resources.

The same three questions were asked about each group comprising the "human resources" of a project. One question concerned the adequacy of the group in facilitating the desired purpose of the component; another inquired about which talents in addition to those possessed by the group would have enabled the project to achieve its stated purpose more fully; and a third sought to determine what major factors prevented the acquisition or full utilization of these desired talents. What follows is a summary of the project directors' responses to these questions, group by group, as well as occasional observations and generalizations that the data seem to support.

Human Resources

The Central Administrative Staff (CAS). In general, project directors rated the adequacy of the CAS in facilitating the desired

purposes of the most successful components very highly. Eighty-six percent of the directors rated the adequacy of the CAS as more than "somewhat" adequate (43% were rated "very" adequate, and another 43% were rated "quite" adequate); only 5 percent of the directors rated the adequacy of the CAS as less than "somewhat" adequate. It is important to note that these data represent a self-appraisal of project directors because they are significant members of the CAS.

The "additional talents" listed most often as being needed to improve the effectiveness of the CAS in more fully achieving the component's purposes included curriculum methods specialists, more people trained in evaluation, more people with knowledge of and skills in working with schools and the community, psychologists-sociologists of the disadvantaged, and more support staff. Other talents listed as in demand were a person to be in daily contact with trainees, an identifiable minority educator, someone to attend meetings, editorial help, more "outside people" to react to our process, an experienced teacher-advisor, and a bilingual director. No single area of "needed talent" stands out.

In identifying factors that have prevented the acquisition or full utilization of these talents, project directors listed financies (mentioned twice as often as any other single factor), time and experience to understand needs, rushed planning, insufficient cooperation by university and school administration, and lack of professional personnel in the area. Factors listed less frequently included insufficient assistance from clusters, late funding, time devoted to increasing

community participation, faculty resistance to management, and academician's reluctance to raise standards. Limited finances and related funding problems seem to stand out as the major obstacles to the acquisition or full utilization of people with desired talents.

The Instructional Staff. Thirty-two of the 37 project directors interviewed (86%) indicated that an instructional staff was associated with their most successful component. Project directors rated the performance of this group of people very highly on the average, but not quite as highly as they rated the performance of the CAS. All of the directors who rated their instruction staffs indicated that they were at least "somewhat adequate" in contributing to the achievement of the desired purpose of the component (somewhat adequate - 10%, quite adequate - 57%, very adequate - 33%).

Instructional staff talents that project directors identified as being needed to more fully achieve purposes of their most successful components included content area consultants, more manpower generally, more experienced teachers of the target population (usually some disadvantaged group of youth), and people with a greater variety of backgrounds and skills. Other, less frequently mentioned talents needed were personnel who were more empirically oriented, people who have taught doctoral level students, more permanent personnel (turnover rate too high), more people specialized in a second language, a Chicano coordinator, people willing to spend time with students, people knowledgeable about group process, and a communicator. Although no single type of instructional staff talent stands out as being in particularly

critical demand in TTT projects, there appears to be a general need for more people who are familiar with the needs and problems of disadvantaged groups served by TTT and who can communicate with these groups.

The most frequently mentioned obstacles to acquiring or fully utilizing instructional staff talents of the kinds just identified were time and financial limits and poor organizational planning. Project directors generally believed that given more time to observe and evaluate their instructional staff needs, they could overcome the few staff problems they had. Other obstacles to improving the instructional staffs' effectiveness included personnel changes, distance, program changes, selection problems, not enough staff commitment, inability to work with experienced teachers, cuts in funds for fellowships (cannot get non-degree oriented people), and campus problems. As will be seen as this report proceeds, "campus problems" were listed time and again as interferring with project operations and effectiveness. This may indicate that TTT staff members and/or participants were involved fairly extensively in student-university problems in the spring of 1970--a situation that would not be surprising given the concern with socio-educational relevant issues that often characterizes TTT projects and personnel.

Participants (students, learners). As will be recalled, 89 percent of the project directors interviewed indicated that there were participants associated with their most successful project component. It should be noted that the reference to participants pertains only to people who are formally enrolled in learning activities. It does not pertain to

university faculty members and others who might be viewed as participants in the program, but whose role is different from that of persons formally enrolled.

Asked whether project participants were of the caliber and background originally hoped for, most project directors (52%) replied, "for the most part"; 35 percent replied "very much so"; 13 percent replied "partially so"; and none replied "not at all". When compared with data rating the adequacy of the central administrative and instructional staffs, these data support the conclusion that project directors are "less pleased" with the adequacy and performance of student participants than they are with the adequacy and performance of the other two groups. This does not mean, of course, that project directors are generally dissatisfied with this group. The point to be made is that project directors believe more effort must be devoted to improving the caliber of student background and/or performance in the near future than to improving the background and/or performance of the central administrative or instructional staff.

In describing characteristics of student-participants that would further facilitate achievement of the objectives of their projects' most successful components, project directors frequently mentioned more academically capable students, more minority people, students at a different age level, students more familiar with the community, students with a greater variety of abilities, and simply more participants. It is interesting to observe that many project directors felt they needed more minority group students to achieve the central purpose of this

component, while others, who had large minority group representation among students, were disappointed in level of skills, especially communication skills, and amount of motivation possessed by these students. This clearly indicates that although many directors recognize the need for minority group representation among participants, they have not yet had enough experience with these groups to know what kind of performance to expect from them or how to improve this level of performance. It is likely that project directors do not detect these kinds of inadequacies in themselves and their instructional staffs.

Other "desired characteristics" of student participants listed by project directors--but less frequently--were teachers with more experience at political action, more school administrators, students with more professional commitment, more participants speaking a second language, people who can get through the program faster, more "inner city"-oriented participants, students with more self-confidence, and more people with definite educational concepts.

The factors most often mentioned as detracting from the acquisition or full utilization of participants with desired background and performance characteristics were insufficient time to recruit, finances, difficulty in locating people, localized recruitment, institutional selection procedures, late funding, and newness of the program. Again, the evaluators get the impression that given more time (and money) to devote to a more thorough recruitment procedure, the project directors feel they could overcome many of the problems of participant backgrounds and performance. With experience, project directors should greatly

improve their ability to recruit and train participants of the kind they desire for their programs.

Some of the less frequently mentioned factors detracting from the acquisition and full utilization of students with characteristics desired by project directors were the difficulty of getting student commitment where the project is in the planning stage and again, personnel changes, the lack of professional commitment by students, and campus problems.

Parity Groups. Project directors were asked to rank the actual relative contribution of the major parity groups (community, education, liberal arts, and schools) to achieving the purpose of their projects' most successful component, and then to indicate what they had originally intended this ranking to be. The directors ranked the actual contribution of people in "education" far ahead of the contribution of any other group. In decreasing order of actual contribution were education, schools, community and liberal arts, with the contributions of community and liberal arts people being very similar in amount. Each parity group was rated as making the "greatest" contribution at least once (education - 14, schools - 5, community - 4, liberal arts - 1) and the "least" contribution at least three times (education - 3, schools - 3, community - 14, liberal arts - 13).[7] These statistics show that no absolute generalization can be made about the relative contributions of the major parity groups in all TTT projects; it is only in looking at the TTT

[7]Although more directors rated community as making the "least" contribution than rated liberal arts as such, liberal arts received more generally low ratings than did the community.

Program as a whole that one could say that education people are contributing more than the other parity groups. Even this generalization can be made only about the contributions parity groups are making in those project components identified by project directors as "most successful".

How did what the project directors perceived as the *actual* relative contribution of the major parity group compare with what they perceived as the *intended* relative contributions of these groups at the outset of their project activity? Very similarly. (What the project directors perceived as reality conformed closely with their expectations of reality.) Taking the parity groups one at a time, the contribution of "education" was perceived as slightly more than expected; "schools" almost exactly as expected; "community" and "liberal arts," slightly less than expected.

In suggesting reasons for the discrepancy between actual and expected contributions (where they existed), project directors most frequently listed: the interest of some groups increased more than that of others as the project became visibly successful; USOE encouraged community participation; priorities shifted; intended groups did not come through with funds and manpower; and estrangement between groups developed. Less frequently mentioned reasons included: current events created issues relevant to the needs of the group; groups had insufficient time to give to the project, parity concept came after initiation of project; TTT threatened intended group (e.g., traditional educationists); group was too far removed from educational problems; lack of commitment; and campus and school problems.

When asked to identify the nature of the contributions made by the parity group that contributed most to achieving the purposes of their most successful components, project directors mentioned (in descending order of frequency): provided mechanics of structuring and carrying on the program (education), acted as a catalyst to other groups (education, community), contributed ideas and personal experiences (community, schools), contributed support and interest (community), cooperated closely and provided mutual stimulation of ideas (schools), placed student teachers (schools), staff (education, liberal arts), selected participants (schools, community), and encouraged experimentation (schools). These data seem to support the generalization that the major forms of contribution made by colleges of education were administrative and instructional. They might also suggest that even though school, community, and liberal arts groups contributed less than education groups in time and energy, these three groups may have made a contribution in "quality" (innovative ideas, encouragement of experimentation, demands for social relevance, etc.) that exceeded that of education groups. The data do seem to support the conclusion that as far as contribution to the TTT Program as a whole (in terms of either quality or quantity) project directors see the liberal arts group as least effective and least valuable. Whether this conclusion serves to justify efforts to make 1970-71 "The Year of the Liberal Arts" for TTT is left open to question. Several directors did indicate that they

opposed crash efforts to emphasize the contributions of any particular parity group during any one period of time.[8]

When asked whether they intended more of a contribution from the groups that contributed least (i.e., usually community and the liberal arts groups), approximately two-thirds of the project directors said "yes." In identifying factors which prevented further contributions from the group which contributed least, directors most frequently listed: poor perception of teacher education (liberal arts), lack of interest, lack of time (liberal arts), inability to relate to social issues (liberal arts), ignorance of schools and social conditions (education, liberal arts), need to expand involvement slowly (community), not originally included (community, schools), hesitant to get involved with minority group program (liberal arts, education), structures for cooperation did not exist (schools, community, and liberal arts), and people too closely identified with own disciplines (liberal arts, education). Other factors cited were: pressure to publish, promotional policy of the university, resistance to innovating contribution of groups scheduled for later in the project, and campus problems.

In discussing what they were doing to increase the participation of the group that was contributing least to the achievement of their successful components' objectives, project directors most often mentioned: giving this group new responsibilities in the program,

---

[8]Remarks to this effect were made at the end of the interview when project directors were asked to comment generally.

hiring a full-time person to foster increased participation, and increasing contacts with this group. Other measures mentioned included: working through doctoral students, changing recruitment, working through the University Coordinating Council, exposing the group to school situations, bringing school administrators into the program, and transferring the program to another department where cooperation already exists. These measures seem to be sound ones worth communicating to all directors in the TTT Program.

Financial Resources

The first concern the evaluators had in assessing the effects of financial resources on the operation of successful project components was the "level of funding": Were projects funded at the levels requested in their original budgets? Were there cuts involved? If there were cuts, how large were they? To what extent, and exactly how, did the cuts affect the proposed activities of the components?

Thirty-six percent of the project directors interviewed indicated that for the past fiscal year (1969-70) their projects had been funded at least at the same level as requested in their original budget proposals; 64 percent indicated that their projects had not been funded at this level. Of the 23 project directors who indicated that cuts had been made in the funds requested in their original proposals, 88 percent rated the cuts as "severe," eight percent rated the cuts as "moderate," and 4 percent rated the cuts as "small." Even though 88 percent of the project directors whose projects had received cuts rated them as severe, only 41 percent of this same

group indicated that the cuts had affected the proposed activities of the component "greatly." This may imply that some project directors over-budgeted in their proposals, but most likely implies that components other than the most successful component were affected.

When adjustments had to be made due to cuts in the expected level of funding, they most often took the form of decreasing the number of participants, rethinking the whole program (in one case the most successful component was added to the program), eliminating other components, decreasing the number of professional people on the staff, and reducing course offerings. Other adjustments identified by project directors included: loss of a residential program, inability to pay undergraduates to participate in seminars, evaluation dropped, reduction in administrative help, elimination of coordination with satellite projects, and pursuit of additional university funds. As can be seen from these data, most of the adjustments forced by reductions in anticipated funds were not of a basic, substantive nature. In general, the proposed activities of components were those that actually were pursued. The major adjustments were ones involving the number of people involved in the program and thus in the size of the operation.

Another major factor affecting the activities of project components was the "timing" of USOE funding. About half the project directors interviewed said their funds were received "when expected"; the other half said that their funds were received "later than expected." The major adjustments in component activities required by delay in funding were delay and difficulty in staffing, difficulty in

recruiting students, rushed planning, poor publicity, and difficulty in arranging for facilities and assistance. Several directors suggested that, in general, federal agencies are insensitive to problems at the local level caused by delays in funding. This insensitivity has an especially drastic effect on universities trying to plan and conduct educational programs funded by the Federal government.

Project directors had considerable difficulty estimating the precise percentage of their funds that came from sources outside of the USOE (i.e., their home institution, school systems, state government, other federal programs, etc.). In most cases, they could simply identify sources of support and the nature (monetary, personnel, physical facilities) of such support.

Twenty-one project directors made some attempt to estimate the percent of their budget provided by their home institution. Of these estimates, nine project directors indicated that the home institution provided 10 percent or less of their budget; five indicated from 11 to 20 percent; four from 21 to 30 percent; and three from 31 to 40 percent.

Most directors were able to list particular types of support furnished by their home institutions. In descending order of frequency mentioned, these included: personnel salaries, supplies and materials, services, employee benefits, facilities, communications, travel, indirect costs, and support fo graduate students. No estimates of the dollar value of these types of support were made.

When asked whether there were any sources of support for their projects other than USOE and their home institutions, 57 percent of the directors said "yes," 43 percent said "no." The major sources of

this kind of support were public school systems. About 50 percent of the directors interviewed indicated that they received some support from the public schools. Typically this support took the form of space, furniture, materials, teachers' and administrators' time, and in a few cases, salaries for TTT staff.

Other sources of support identified by project directors were state government, other federal programs, public T.V., 4-H Extension, business and industry, and a professional teachers' association.

The reported degree of support provided by local resources and its relation to institutional commitment to the TTT Program can be viewed in different ways. One way is to see the financial contributions of local sources as insignificant and therein conclude that the sponsoring institution lacks commitment to the TTT Program. The other way is to view more optimistically the significance of the reported support. The later observation is perhaps the more valid. This conclusion is based on several factors. One is that it was assumed that project budgets would reflect the contributions of the local institutions. They generally did not. The reason for this is that the first year's budget, which was designed prior to the project becoming operational, would not reflect any commitments made during the actual operation of the project. It is clear that the operation of a project results in the interaction of groups and frequently commitments are made after these interactions take place. Secondly, many project directors did indicate the commitments of people and institutions which are not reflected on a budgetary ledger. People and institutions were committing time, facilities, etc. for

which they were not being directly reimbursed. This is a significant finding. Third, a line budget item of local contributions to a project does not necessarily represent a behavioral commitment. Finally, project directors did indicate a significant financial commitment of many institutions (e.g., schools) was being made for the second year of the project's operation. To summarize, it is the opinion of the evaluators that commitments to the National TTT Program were being made at the project level. These commitments were not visible at first glance, but are apparent upon closer inspection of the data.

In closing this section on funding and other sources of support for TTT projects, it should be noted that the most frequently mentioned suggestion for improving the National TTT Program made by project directors at the end of the telephone interview was "the adoption of more stable, and hopefully continuous, funding procedures." The amount of time and energy that is consumed in the writing of yearly proposals to obtain funds to continue operation is extensive and represents the greatest single obstacle to smooth project operation and effectiveness. The time and energy spent in writing such proposals is time and energy taken away from potentially creative and productive work. If there is one thing this report should convey, it is this need for better funding procedures in the TTT Program. Multi-year funding should probably be given highest priority in changes "pushed for" by National TTT Program administrators.[9]

---

[9]The suggestion for long-range planning and support of Federally sponsored Programs has been made by various persons and committees. See, for example, the comments of James Gallagher, Educational Researcher, Vol. XXI, June, 1970.

Activities and Outcomes of Most Successful Components

In this section of the phone interview, the evaluators shifted their attention from "inputs" which affected the activities and outcomes of a project's most successful component to the activities and outcomes themselves. The major activities and outcomes of interest were those pertaining to a project component's (or a whole project's) organizational structure, communication patterns, personnel, curricula, and cooperative working arrangements with other units. Of special interest were examples of "institutional change" in any of these dimensions: situations in which the activities and outcomes of successful components in TTT projects involved (or required) changes in the "normal" college of education, university, public school, and/or community procedures, relations or activities.

The first question asked project directors was whether any programs with a purpose or focus similar to that of their most successful component had existed at thier home institution prior to the funding of their TTT projects. Approximately 20 percent of the directors interviewed indicated that such programs did exist prior to the funding of their projects; 80 percent indicated that the purpose pursued by their component was "new" in their home institution. These data provide strong evidence of the innovative character of at least the "purposes" of the successful components in TTT projects. When directors who indicated that programs with a similar purpose existed at their institutions were asked to describe any differences

between the purposes of the present TTT project component and a previous program, they listed: new inner-city focus, present program puts theory into practice, action-project-field-oriented doctoral program, more active involvement of schools, and parity involvement of other groups. These differences seem very consistent with the overall goals and philosophy of the TTT Program.

Besides differing in purposes, programs can differ in the means used to achieve these purposes. Different types of organizational structures, decision-making procedures, cooperative working arrangements, and curricula can be used to achieve general goals that are often similar in character, although differences in such means usually affect the specific character of a program's purposes and outcomes, and vice-versa. A large part of the rationale behind the TTT Program has been that if you organize differently to solve even rather traditional problems in teacher education (e.g., include groups not normally involved in planning and carrying out teacher education programs) the results will be different and hopefully better. Let us now examine some of the means used to achieve the purposes of successful components, paying particular attention to innovative means and outcomes that might be associated with them.

Structure and Activities of Advisory Committees

Eighty-six percent of the project directors interviewed indicated that their projects had an advisory committee or some similar body. The groups most often mentioned as being represented on advisory committees were community representatives, college of education faculty, liberal arts faculty, public school representatives (mostly teachers),

school administrators, university students, LAS administrators, school principals, and student teachers. Other groups mentioned less frequently included: representatives from state departments of education and professional teachers' associations; a university chancellor; a director of a Model Cities program; directors (two) of Head Start Programs; foundation personnel; and representatives from the business community, the P.T.A., and the League of Women Voters. It would be difficult for the "actual" composition of TTT advisory committees (considered collectively) to conform more precisely with the type of composition identified as "ideal" by TTT program planners. Certain individual projects had difficulty in recruiting representatives from particular parity groups to serve on their advisory committees, but considered on the whole, TTT projects were very successful in this regard.

Approximately 95 percent of those directors who indicated that their projects did have advisory committees stated that the composition of these committees was not what one would typically expect at their home institutions. The major differences these directors listed were more involvement of community, more involvement of school people, "parity representation" generally, and more cooperation between education and liberal arts faculties and administration. Other differences mentioned were professionals cannot out-vote non-professionals, a lay person chairs a policy-making board, involvement of students, extensive LAS representation, and the very fact that an advisory committee exists at all.

By far the most frequently mentioned "primary function" of advisory committees was that of establishing program policy. The next most mentioned "primary functions" (in descending order of frequency) were advising the director, ratifying policies suggested by the staff, evaluation, support, and selection of participants and staff. Other functions mentioned included: feeding information to participating institutions, acting as a resource group for the community, advising state superintendent of public instruction and/or state board of education, identifying community perspective on teachers and the schools, and using the agencies represented by committee members for implementation of changes.

Although active participation is implied in "establishing program policy," judging from most of the other primary functions listed, advisory committees seem to play a more reactive role in program activity. They tend to be used as sounding boards for ideas initiated by project staff members or as "administrative liaisons" between project staff members and other groups (school, community) rather than as "idea originating" committees actively involved in determining project policy. To be sure, both active and reactive roles are important in the conduct of any program. Evidence that advisory committees tend to play a more reactive role is provided by data on how they affected the activities of projects' most successful components. Although many project directors stated that these committees were the "ultimate policy-makers," probing often showed that their policy-making power took the form of approving or vetoing policy suggestions made by staff members. Among the most often mentioned ways that advisory committees

affected the activities of successful project components were advising, approving policy, selecting and recruiting fellows, evaluating, selecting schools for projects, making contacts with the community, and helping implement policies of the project. All of these activities support the conclusion that advisory committees play an advisory-implementative-facilitative role in TTT projects rather than as active policy-initiating role.

Only about 13 percent of the project directors interviewed indicated that a policy change was required in their home institution to form advisory committees. In most cases, institutions were flexible enough not to require any actual policy change for establishing advisory committees. However, project directors were able to identify institutional changes that had resulted from the establishment of advisory committees. These included alternation of college admission requirements, governance of academic matters by non-academics, and increased input from the community and schools in university decision-making. Generally speaking, it appears that in projects in which institutional policy changes were required for the establishment of advisory committees, a more active role of advisory members in program planning resulted.

Decision-making

Shifting attention now to general decision-making patterns within successful project components, approximately 90 percent of the project directors interviewed said that the decision-making process of their most successful component was shared by groups or individuals other

than the administrators of the component. In descending order of frequency mentioned, the groups included: advisory committees, instructional staff, school and community people, and students. Of the 33 directors who indicated that such groups were involved in decision-making, 85 percent believed that involvement of these kinds of groups represented a change in the practices of their home institution. About 20 percent of these same directors indicated that actual changes in "instructional policy" were required for such involvement. Among the most frequently mentioned policy changes required were change in admission policy for candidates, change in policy concerning standards for faculty selection (e.g., community people appointed to faculty), change in policy regarding curricula and degrees (non-academics having voting rights), and policy change where inter-disciplinary groups made decisions about programs. These changes represent evidence of very significant institutional change that has been brought about by TTT programs (but are not unrelated to the "power movements" within higher education). Considering the fact that most TTT projects have been operative only one year, the changes are impressive.

Cooperative Working Arrangements

Another form of institutional change that the evaluators thought might be important in connection with the activities of TTT projects were changes in "cooperative working arrangements" between TTT staff members and groups inside and outside the university. Because it was felt that changes in these relationships might not have been discussed (explicitly, at least) by project directors in talking about changes

in the decision-making process, questions about them were included in a separate section of the telephone interview.

Close to 70 percent of the project directors interviewed said that there had been an increase in cooperative working relations among their projects and other groups within the university, both inside and outside the college of education. Increased working relationships between project staff members and college of education personnel were especially noteworthy. For example, one college of education administration facilitated a college thrust around the TTT project, responsibility for development of materials was shared by project and college of education personnel, and the college of education provided offices and personnel in the schools where their TTT project has a field activity.

Many examples of new working relationships between college of education personnel and liberal arts personnel were identified; the most common type was an informal exchange of instructional staff members between the two colleges, e.g., English, math, geography, history, and other LAS staff visiting education classrooms for lectures and discussions, and vice-versa. Other interesting changes in working relationships between these two groups included: liberal arts and education faculty and staff members serving together on project coordinating committees; department of history task forces including education faculty in restructuring basic courses; liberal arts and education faculty going into the schools to hold seminars; various liberal arts and social work faculty members observing and

evaluating teachers and student teachers; and cooperation between education and liberal arts faculty in math and English on curriculum development activities.

Among the university departments having personnel represented part-time in TTT projects were English, sociology, physics, economics, geography and of course, education. Approximately one-third of the directors interviewed indicated that new joint appointments across traditional department or unit lines had resulted from the influence of TTT in the university setting. New joint appointments were reported to have been created between colleges of education and departments of English, foreign languages, geography, earth science, and economics, largely through the influence of TTT project activity.

In summary, evidence of changes in cooperative working arrangements within colleges of education and between the college of education and various LAS department stemming from the influence of TTT is large and impressive. This is no more impressive, however, than the evidence available on increased cooperative working arrangements among these groups and groups outside of the university environment as a result of TTT activity.

Among the groups mentioned most often by project directors as having increased cooperative working arrangements with colleges of education and liberal arts as a result of TTT activity were people from the public schools, informal community groups, community leadership, the Model Cities Program, professional associations, day-care centers, and state departments of education. (Public

school personnel were most often mentioned.) Many other groups were identified, however, and listing them gives some information about the kind of involvement TTT projects have outside the university environment. These groups include: Career Opportunity Program, Urban Affairs Center, Urban Observatory, State Human Rights Commission, liberal arts associations within the states, detention centers, police departments, neighborhood centers, Poor People's Federation, School Readiness Program, city managers, Consortium on Inner-City Teaching, Regional Coordinating Council, educational resources regional centers, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Black Youth United, Head Start, Board of Cooperative Services, Title VII Projects, College of Arts and Sciences Foundation, architects, Art Guild, drop-out organizations, community action committees, computer industries, County Institute for Children (delinquents), parochial schools, COPE Project, American Native Church, Spanish American Center, PTA, labor organizations, National Council of Teachers of English, Council Against Poverty, Lower Westside Community Council, N.Y.C. Department of Cultural Affairs, Welfare Federation (Manpower), and many others. The social relevancy of the TTT program that was noted so strongly by TTT site visitors late in 1969 is underscored by this list of groups which work closely with TTT projects.

In describing the nature of the working relationships with groups just mentioned (e.g., how these groups affected or were affected by TTT project activity), project directors most often listed: consulting, providing facilities, providing personnel to project, providing in-service training, developing courses, cooperating on teacher certification or student teaching, helping develop project structure,

recruiting students, and serving as a site for observation. (Note the preponderance of responses pertaining to ways the public schools or "public school people" cooperated with the project.) Other ways in which groups outside the university worked with TTT projects included making available research findings, co-sponsoring activities, providing an opportunity for TTT students to visit and work with them, serving as discussants in workshops, helping develop materials, giving feedback on project activities, and providing support.

When asked whether any of these cooperative working arrangements had resulted in policy changes in their home institutions, project directors were able to identify a few, but not many. Many did express the belief, however, that such policy changes were going to be made in the near future as a result of TTT influence. Among the policy changes (or at least significant "institutional changes") that project directors listed were cooperation of the home institution with social action agencies such as the NAACP, legitimizing of joint appointments in public schools and the university, creation of a full-time liaison with the community, giving academic rank and tenure to a project director without a doctorate, alteration in doctoral program and undergraduate course requirements, education professors teaching in liberal arts classes, reassessment of admissions requirements, and the opportunity for university staff members to work part-time in the Model Cities Program.

The project directors were asked to estimate the extent to which new working relationships among TTT projects and groups inside and

outside the university had changed the non-educator's involvement in the training of teachers. Fifteen percent of the project directors felt the involvement was "substantial." Forty percent responded "quite a bit." Thirty-three percent indicated "somewhat." Six percent responded "a little" and an additional six percent responded "not at all." Especially considering the short length of time TTT projects have been in operation, these ratings appear to be very encouraging. A similar estimate by site visitors of progress made toward involving groups other than educators in TTT activities (and thus in teacher training) was even larger than that just made by directors themselves. All in all, TTT progress in this area seems very adequate at this point in time.

Curriculum

For the purpose of the telephone interview, "curriculum" was defined as "any program which has as its purpose the instruction or service of a clientele." Eighty-eight percent of the project directors indicated the existence of a curricular aspect to their most successful component. When directors with curricular aspects were asked to distinguish between "degree" and "non-degree" curricular experience, approximately 20 percent of the directors interviewed said that there were "only degree" experiences associated with their most successful components; 30 percent said there were only "non-degree" curricular experiences; and 38 percent said there were "both" degree and non-degree curricular experiences associated with these components.

When those project directors who indicated that there were "degree" curricular experiences associated with their most successful components (including those who responded "both") were asked whether any of these experiences were "new" to their home institutions, they all replied in the affirmative. The most frequently mentioned types of new curricular experiences identified by these project directors were field experiences for graduate students, seminars at the masters and doctoral level, individualized instruction for master level participants, methods courses "in the field" for undergraduates, dissertation research that was "field" or problem-oriented, the elimination of courses, community experiences for masters and doctoral level students, seminars on the problems of the educationally disadvantaged at the doctoral level, and communication courses for doctoral students. An overwhelming majority of these new curricular experiences involve "field" experiences for graduate students. These data seem to support the conclusion that the TTT Program is focusing its attention on increasing the sensitivity of at least TT level students to community and school problems by giving them first hand experience with these problems.

Responses to other questions on these "new" curricular experiences reveal that they are attended almost entirely by TTT students (fellows) and are in fact geared to the special interests and backgrounds of this group. Several directors indicated that curricular experiences had been added, dropped, or re-ordered according to the interests and abilities of students. Generally speaking, the participant interests most influential on the content of these new curricular experiences

have been those associated with student concern about inner-city education, the dynamics of change in the schools, and better models for the training of teachers. Many project directors expressed desire either to open these new curricular experiences to regular students attending their home institutions, or, by setting a good example, to influence their home institutions to offer similar experiences to these students. About 80 percent of the leadership for the new curricular experiences has been provided by TTT project staff and 20 percent by regular institution staff.

Approximately 65 percent of directors who indicated that "degree" curricular experiences were provided in connection with their most successful components said that some of these represented "revisions" of prior curricular experiences offered at their home institutions (as opposed to being entirely "new" experiences). In most cases, "revisions" had involved both content changes and alterations in methods. As was true of the "new" curricular experiences, "revised" curricula were tailored to the interests and backgrounds of TTT students, and in much the same ways.

About one-third of the new and revised "degree" experiences required some sort of policy change in the institution in which they were offered. Among policy changes were revisions in entrance requirements for advanced degrees, joint offerings of courses by several departments, creation of a new degree (Doctor of Arts in Teaching), revisions in topics available for dissertations, partial restructuring of the School of Education, and in one case, redesigning the total educational program (elimination of grades, courses, and credits).

About 80 percent of the time, persons associated with two or more of the parity groups in TTT played a major role in the design of new or revised curricular offerings. In fact, project directors indicated that representatives from each of the four major parity groups contributed about equally to this task, although public school people contributed slightly more than any other group. Only three directors indicated that students played a significant role in designing new and revised curricular experiences.

Turning now to curricular experiences, new or revised, associated with successful components that are "non-degree" in nature, project directors described these experiences as usually taking the form of seminars, observation and involvement in schools, summer or intersession institutes, action team committee work, in-service instruction, and workshops in the community. The focus of these curricular experiences tended to be community and school problems, and the means for understanding and dealing with them was direct student contact with people immediately involved with these problems (i.e., school and community people). The type of participants most project directors mentioned as taking part in these "non-degree" curricular experiences were education faculty, liberal arts faculty, graduate students in education, teachers, school administrators, community representatives, and student teachers. Generally speaking, these participants were people who were established and secure in particular professional roles and were motivated to do something to make their work more socially relevant and educationally effective. Many directors expressed concern

that people who would benefit most from these kinds of experiences did not participate because they would receive no formal academic credit for their effort. It would not be surprising to find out that these "non-degree" experiences offered by TTT projects were among the most successful for the simple reason that they have attracted only people who are genuinely concerned about the problems they address.

When asked what unique characteristics, if any, were possessed by the people providing leadership for these non-degree experiences, project directors most often mentioned that they were school and community leaders, top specialists in their field in the country, "part of the system that has the power to make changes," creative, exceptionally able to coordinate groups, and knowledgeable about the community and community problems. As a rule, fewer of the leaders of non-degree programs came from colleges of education and liberal arts than was true of the leaders of degree experiences.

The final section on curriculum in the phone interview dealt with "curricular products" (associated with successful project components) created for consumption by schools for the training of teachers. Approximately 60 percent of the directors interviewed said that such curricular products had been produced. In descending order of frequency mentioned, the curricular products identified were video tapes for teachers and for in-service training, syllabi for "a method of training teachers of teachers," packages of games and simulation activities, written descriptions of methods or materials, elementary science units for inner-city children, and "publication" generally.

Other curricular products identified included curriculum materials for high school students, experimental materials in math, English and reading for inner-city children, reports on internship programs, story books for Indians, a humanities program including art, music, and social studies, exchange programs between pilot and regular schools, micro-labs, and others.

Communication Patterns

When asked whether communications with separate parity groups (including students) had increased since the inception of TTT at their home institutions, the vast majority of project directors indicated that communications had increased with all parity groups during this period of time. Responses of project directors show that communications increased most with public school people, then community, liberal arts, students and teacher education people, respectively. It should have been expected that communications with teacher education, students, and liberal arts people would increase relatively less than communication with school and community people since traditional programs of teacher education have been centered in colleges and universities. One would have thought, however, that there would have been a greater increase in communication with community people than with public school people. It is difficult to know whether the data can best be explained as a function of problems encountered in trying to establish communication with community people or as an indication that less interaction with public school people occurred prior to TTT than was

realized. At any rate, the data are encouraging in showing that communications have increased significantly with two groups not usually represented in teacher education programs.

Project directors indicated that most of the communication between project staff members and the parity group with which they communicated most frequently (usually public school or community people) was "face-to-face" communication, and that telephone communication was more frequent than written communication. They also generally indicated that the other group initiated the communication as often as did project staff members.

As for the substance of the communication between project people and this group (again, usually school and community people), by far most often mentioned was discussion about planning and executing the program. Other topics offered frequently included: following up on activities, problems encountered in carrying out the program, policy, placement of graduates, conduct of seminars, and recruitment of participants. Among topics mentioned at least once were exploring ways to extend opportunities to community people, probing ways to involve parents in schools, seeking to discover which social issues are most important in schools, and administrative procedures. All of this communication is of a sort that lends credability to the conclusion that school and community groups are playing an increasing role in teacher training programs sponsored by TTT.

Least Successful Components

The report up to this point has presented a detailed analysis of "successful" components. This section examines briefly "least successful" components associated with TTT projects in order to identify typical problems faced in TTT projects as well as to seek suggestions for dealing with these problems. The discussion which follows is thus divided into two parts: problems encountered and ideas for problem solutions.

Problems Encountered

A very wide range of problems were identified by project directors, but few problems common to many projects emerged from the data. In fact, the most frequently any one problem was mentioned was four times, and this difficulty was the very general one of directors having inaccurate expectations concerning the role various groups could play in their programs. Other problems mentioned more than once included the inflexibility of LAS and Education faculties (3 times), feelings of inferiority among school people (particularly teachers) relative to university faculty and administrators (2), rigidity of teachers lack of cooperation between two or more parity groups (2), difficulty in maintaining communication between all of the groups working in the project (2), difficulty in involving LAS effectively (2), and personnel problems (2).

Difficulty in involving the community in teacher education (mentioned once) was also suggested by project directors. Comments

of several other project directors included lack of interest by the "Anglo" community, unclear conception of community, and difficulty (lack of know-how) in recruiting community representatives.

Directors frequently mentioned problems stemming from new programs with non-traditional role expectations for staff and participants. Included among these were inadequate time to plan participant involvement, poor rapport between lab staff and experienced teachers, anxiety produced by internal reform of the university, weak advisor-advisee relationships, inability to involve all participants, instructors could not work in teams, steering committee gets tied up on petty problems, difficulty in planning a program while allowing participants sufficient autonomy, and demands on teachers were too great.

Among the most important of other problems mentioned were lack of program visibility in university, school system, and community, change in OE guidelines, slowness in changing from theory to practice, lack of support system for change agents in schools, lack of cooperation from school administrators, unwillingness of schools to make commitments (to programs like TTT) because the instability of the current social-educational scene makes them unsure where they stand, bureaucracy of civil service, and difficulty in involving undergraduates. To repeat, many problems were identified; few were common to many projects.

Ideas for Problem Solutions

The most frequently mentioned suggestions for the solution of different problems--as might be expected--were more time and experience with the problems in question and more money with which to deal

with them. Time and experience were considered a more important factor than money.

The two project directors who expressed concern over inadequate communication among groups participating in the project planned to publish a periodic newsletter to improve such communication. Directors who had difficulty involving LAS representatives and other participants effectively during the first year of operations believed that such involvement could have been increased significantly had a greater effort been made earlier to stimulate such involvement.

A number of the suggestions concerned staffing: reduce personnel changes, increase university professors' experience in the schools, recruitment of people with more experience with urban schools, and perform a better search for personnel.

Two directors recommended alterations in USOE procedures: national guidelines should not be changed in mid-program, and USOE should define *community* specifically and suggest ways of contacting community people, but, on the latter point another director said, "We need to distinguish *communities* rather than to attempt to work with *the community*."

Among the solutions offered by project directors were many which apply to multiple problems: more effort at foresight (planning, anticipation) rather than hindsight, more public relations, redistribute priorities, cool down campus unrest, reduce the dissimilarity among project components, improve the structure of the governing board, encourage more candid discussion of role problems within the

project, expand into Mexican-American schools, spend less time in training and more on organization, implement desegregation, cut down scope of program in proportion to cuts in funds, reduce number of university departments with which project works, pay undergraduates to participate in program seminars, pay teacher substitutes when teachers leave schools to participate in TTT function, and use present fellows to plan program for future fellows (i.e., increase student participation). In addition to indicating how problems they identified might be solved in the future, project directors often suggested how these problems originated and how they could be avoided by others.

When asked what priority the component encountering the most problems had at the beginning of this past year's activity (high, medium, low), almost one-half the project directors replied "high," one-quarter replied "medium," and one-quarter replied "low." Half of these directors indicated that these components had a different priority now, the vast majority indicating an increase in priority. Hence, one could safely assume that project directors recognize where problems lie and are increasing the amount of time, attention, and in some cases money that they are devoting to the solution of these problems.

General Assessment of Program

At the end of the telephone interview, project directors were given an opportunity to comment on any aspects of the National TTT

Program about which they had strong feelings, positive or negative. They were assured that their responses would be completely anonymous so that their comments could be a true expression of their attitudes, beliefs, and judgments.

By far the most frequently mentioned area of concern was the annual funding pattern of the TTT Program. A majority of the directors believed that long-term (at least three-year) funding is essential for recruiting degree candidates and a staff (especially teaching faculty). The annual funding pattern was mentioned again and again as a major obstacle to effective program planning and operation. Having to interrupt normal activities to write annual proposals seems to have broken continuity of effort more than any other single factor. Hence, long-range funding should be the first priority item on national program administrators' list of changes requested by project directors and their staffs.

The second most frequently mentioned suggestion for improving the program concerned the creation of a central TTT idea clearinghouse. The frequency of this request seems to indicate that the TTT clusters have not been as effective as was hoped at disseminating ideas among participating projects, although the regional geographic structure of the clusters may be a significant factor behind this area of dissatisfaction.[10] Several directors believe that useful

[10]Four directors explicitly referred to the clusters as "useless." Three others felt that the goals of the clusters should be clarified, especially as they relate to the goals of LTI-TTT.

ideas could be obtained from TTT projects outside of their cluster, especially from those projects with aims and objectives closely resembling their own. A central clearinghouse appears to be most useful for the purpose of disseminating ideas among projects with similar thrusts located in different parts of the country.

Several project directors expressed dissatisfaction about the mid-year change in parity guidelines. A typical comment of this sort was that "excellent original guidelines have slipped by the wayside and have been replaced by guidelines based on current whims or perceived emergencies." Many directors opposed the concept of concentrating yearly efforts on particular parity groups--last year "the year of the community," next year "the year of liberal arts." General assessment was expressed that parity means different things in different projects and that decisions concerning allocation of efforts during any one period of time should be made by local projects after assessment of the local and national social-educational situation. Many directors did believe, however, that an attempt to define the concept of "parity participation" more clearly (perhaps by LTI-TTT) would be useful at this point in the program's history.

Directors expressed contradictory opinions on LTI-TTT. About an equal number believed LTI needed more power in order to play a more active role in TTT as believed USOE should "lead" rather than LTI-TTT. Comments were fairly widespread that LTI-TTT had not performed as active and useful a role as it could have in the Program.

A variety of other ideas and suggestions were mentioned more than once by project directors: every TTT project should have more freedom to design itself; the concept of four parity groups is simplistic; site visit was not sufficient to see the program; USOE does not communicate enough with projects; USOE should reveal criteria for decision-making (e.g., refunding); USOE should spotlight a few highly effective programs to gain funds to expend; funding should come on time; August proposals should be eliminated (or deferred); and projects need help with evaluation. Three positive comments mentioned two or more times were that the parity procedure is useful in changing teacher behavior, the TTT program is a "fantastic vehicle for creative people," and that TTT has had a good impact on university professors.

Because the evaluators believe the project directors' general assessment of the program and their suggestions for its improvement are important, the total list of once-mentioned responses is included here. These responses were as follows: TTT meetings give some unrealistic expectations of roles which cannot be filled because universities usually retain control; viewing LAS as unitary is inappropriate; the TTT empire has created so many entities that the machine may get out of control; TTT objectives should have been better defined before the program was implemented; lack of definition by TTT made budget planning difficult; students rate full parity involvement; USOE should not arbitrarily reduce funding; more national publicity might encourage more local support; HEW is last in the push for "dramatic progress"; must include minority groups in top-level

positions for planning and program continuity; need ways to assess projects' effectiveness (more achievement measures than just formal structure measures); programs tend to be too ambitious; TTT Program is mis-managed; USOE does not involve projects in major decision-making' lack of coordination and communication among national program administrators (instability of personnel is a factor); USOE does not meet deadlines; must change concept of "have meetings to organize programs"; public school problems are a greater obstacle to progress than are TTT organizational problems; USOE should fund more programs concentrating on the TTT level; community component is still entirely inadequate at most places; program should be restructured after NSF model; LTI-TTT should play a more active lobby role; hope TTT does not become overly minority-oriented; EPDA programs are not coordinated; need stipends for minority group people in fifth year program; difficult to give degree people a teacher's education program in one year; should plan meetings a full year ahead so budgets are not disrupted; need to keep the door open to new TTT projects; action team format is a good training vehicle; USOE should put money where there presently are no doctoral programs, but where there is a potential for them; need more communication with other teacher education projects; need a "depth conference of directors" without a hassle from other groups; USOE should reverse trend in funding--give little initially and then expand; projects should be put in a neutral agency (not the university) to make parity work; USOE has bad public relations; TTT should pay more attention to the role of professional associations; need to train

clerks for projects; need more flexible evaluation instruments; hope program does not become degree granting (participants are more likely to be dedicated when they are not working toward degrees); once USOE accepts a proposal, they should not require changes in a project; and although there is a lack of national guidelines this is good), LTI thinks there is a "right way."

In closing this section on the general assessment of the Program by project directors, it should be emphasized that although most directors had concrete suggestions for improving the Program, almost all were very satisfied with the responsiveness of National Program administrators to suggestions for change and were optimistic that the Program would be able to improve its effectiveness in the future. In addition to the positive comments about the Program mentioned earlier in this section were others such as "USOE is making a valiant effort"; 'the program has tremendous potential"; "the TTT Washington office is very helpful, understanding, and supportive"; and, "community involvement is good." Several directors agreed that "TTT's strength is that it encourages a developmental approach and does not rely on a fixed, uniform model."

APPENDIX A: 1969-70 TTT Project Director
Phone Interview Schedule

1969-70 TTT PROJECT DIRECTOR PHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Trainers of Teacher Trainers Evaluation
Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation
270 Education Building, University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois 61801

Respondent's Name _____ Respondent's Number _____

Project _____

Project Address _____

Interviewer's Name _____ Interview Date _____

A. Pre-Interview Correspondence

Date(s) appointment letter sent:

_____

Date appointment card returned:

_____

Date confirmation card sent:

_____

Day and time of confirmed interview:

_____

Date of confirmed interview:

_____

Telephone number: _____

B. To be Completed by Interviewer

Interview starting time: _____

Interview ending time: _____

Minutes to complete: _____

Schedule edited: _____

Date thanks sent: _____

Date schedule filed: _____

C. To be Completed by Coder

Date(s) coded: _____

Coding completed: _____

D. Interviewer's Messages to Staff

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

TTT PROJECT DIRECTOR PHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Note to Interviewer: *Use this schedule to record the responses of the interviewer. Record responses as close to verbatim as possible. Immediately afterwards edit the recorded responses and make sure all questions with precoded response categories are completed.*

Alter the introductory and concluding remarks, if you like, to suite your own style of speech. Feel free also to use whatever transitional remarks you want in order to keep the interview going smoothly (e.g., "Very interesting . . ." "I see . . ." "Could you elaborate further . . . " "And now, I'd like to turn to the questions about the . . ."). But ask the questions exactly as they are written, and, except where the conversation leads naturally to a question out of sequence, ask them in the order they are written to assure comparability of the interviews.

Interview: Hello *(interviewee's name)*. This is *(your name)* at CIRCE, the Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation at the University of Illinois. I appreciate this opportunity to hear your observations about your project and certain aspects of the National TTT Program. I hope our letter to you adequately explained the reasons for this interview; but if you have any questions, I will try to answer them before I continue. *(Answer any questions -- hopefully briefly.)*

Very well, let me indicate that the responses you provide will be used in summary form only, for the purpose of describing the total TTT program to the program administrators. In no way will your remarks be attributed to you personally or to the project you direct. We recognize that some of the questions we are asking may have been asked in other contexts or that answers to some questions may be available in existing documents. But to be sure we have a complete and up-to-date description of your project, we feel it is necessary that certain questions be asked at this time, even if asking them may seem redundant.

Let's begin, then, by talking about your professional background and experience as the Director of a Triple-T project.

1. BIOGRAPHICAL BACKGROUND

1.1 Am I correct in assuming that you have a doctor's degree?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 1.3)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 1.2)*

1.2 *(If no)* What is your highest earned degree?

Bachelor's . . . 1( )
Master's . . . . 2( ) [*Go to Q. 1.4*]
Other _____ 3( )
(specify)

1.3 *(If yes)* Is it a doctorate in education or some other field, or what?

Ph.D. . . . . 1( )
Ed.D. . . . . 2( )
Other _____ . . 3( )
(specify)

1.4 What was your major field of study? _____

_____

1.5 From what institution did you receive this degree?

_____
(institution) *(city)* *(state)*

1.6 And in what year? _____

1.7 Can you tell me the month and year you officially became director of your project?

_____
(month) *(year)*

1.8 With reference to project funding, when did you assume the project directorship -- before, at the same time, or after the project was funded?

Assumed leadership for obtaining TTT project funds <u>prior</u> to initial funding of project, and have served as director since . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 1.11)*

Became director the <u>same time</u> the project was initially funded, but had no prior affiliation . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 1.11)*

Became director <u>after</u> project's initial funding and after it had been operational . . . . . 3( ) *(Go to Q. 1.9)*

1.9 *(If director assumed duties <u>after</u> project was in operation)* Who immediately preceded you as director? *(If position was never filled, indicate so.)*

Name [Mr., Mrs., Miss] _____
(last) *(first)*

1.10 Why did the previous director leave the position?

_____

_____

1.11 Does someone presently co-direct the project with you?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 1.12)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 1.13)*

1.12 *(If yes)* Who is it?

Name [Mr., Mrs., Miss] _____
(last) *(first)*

1.13 In what place (institution or agency) is your project primarily administered?

University . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 1.14)*
College . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 1.15)*
State Education Department . . . . . 3( )
Public School System . . . . . 4( ) [*Go to Q. 1.16*]
Other _____ . . . 5( )
(specify)

1.14 *(If university)* Within what college (or school) is it administered?

Graduate College . . . . . 1( )
LAS College. . . . . 2( )
Education College. . . . . 3( ) [*Go to Q. 1.15*]
Other _____ . . 4( )
(specify)

1.15 *(If university or college)* In what department or departments?

_____

1.16 How long have you been at _____*(indicate institution)*?

_____

Less than 1 year . . . . . 1( )
1 - 2 years. . . . . 2( )
3 - 5 years. . . . . 3( )
6 - 10 years . . . . . 4( )
More than 10 years . . . . . 5( )

1.17 Aside from having the title of Director of this project, do you have any other title which might tell me something about the rank or status you have at _____ *(indicate place)*, and if so, what is it?

_____

_____

1.18 How long have you had this title? _____

Less than 1 year . . . . . 1( )
1 - 2 years. . . . . 2( )
3 - 5 years. . . . . 3( )
More than 5 years. . . . . 4( )

1.19 If your project had not been refunded for 1970-71, would _____ _____*(indicate institution)* have continued your contract?

Yes . . . 1( ) No . . . . 2( ) Don't Know . . . 3( )

2. DESCRIPTIONS AND GOALS OF PROJECT COMPONENTS

Now I'm going to shift the focus of this interview from your background to the major components or areas of your project. We will want to list the major components of your project, and then discuss that component which has been most successful, and, afterwards, that component which has been least successful.

When we talk about "major components", we mean those salient features or basic elements around which your project is organized. These features may involve subject-matter, methods, or clients. They serve as a means of communicating to others what your project is about. *(Discuss further with the respondent what you mean by a component until the interviewee understands what a component is.)*

2.1 Have we reached the point where you could list the major components of your project for this past academic year? If so, let's list them, beginning with the most important or major component.

a. _____

_____

b. _____

_____

2.1 (Continued)

c. _____

_____

d. _____

_____

e. _____

_____

2.2 Which of the components we just listed would you regard as the most successful? *(Indicate letter)* _____

2.3 Which would you regard as least successful? *(Indicate letter)* _____

2.4 Let's start with the most successful component, which is _____ _____*(name of component)*, and talk about the objectives, inputs, activities, and outcomes associated with it. In general, would you consider this project component a planning, a pilot, or an operational activity?

Planning . . . . . 1( )
Pilot. . . . . 2( )
Operational. . . . . 3( )
Other _____. . 4( )
(specify)

2.5 Are there participants (students or learners) associated with this most successful component?

Yes . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 2.6)* *(Make note of response*
No . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 2.8)* *for Q. 3.8, page 10.)*

2.6 What is the level of education of participants in the _____ _____*(name of component)*? That is, are they primarily high school, paraprofessional, . . . postdoctoral level participants? *(Interviewer read the response categories to complete the question.)*

High School. . . . . 1( )
Paraprofessional . . . . . 2( )
Preservice/undergraduate . . . . . 3( )
Inservice/postgraduate . . . . . 4( )
Masters. . . . . 5( )
Doctoral . . . . . 6( )
Postdoctoral . . . . . 7( )

2.7 *(If at least in-service, that is, in-service, masters, doctoral, postdoctoral)* What is the typical background of your participants? Are they administrators or teachers, blacks or whites, young or middle aged, etc.?

_____

_____

_____

2.8 Of the following groups: teachers, teacher trainers, trainers of teacher trainers, which group benefits most directly from the activities of this project component? *(Select one)*

Teachers (pre- or in-service) . . . . 1( )
Teacher Trainers . . . . . 2( )
Trainers of Teacher Trainers . . . . 3( )

2.9 Who benefits indirectly from its activities? *(Check all that apply)*

School Children . . . . . 1( )
Teachers . . . . . 2( )
Teacher Trainers . . . . . 3( )
Trainers of Teacher Trainers . . . 4( )
Other _____ . . 5( )
(specify)

2.10 With what level of training is this project component primarily concerned?

Pre-school . . . . . 1( )
Elementary . . . . . 2( )
Secondary . . . . . 3( )
Junior/Community College . . . . . 4( )
College . . . . . 5( )
University . . . . . 6( )

2.11 Is there any target population toward which the activities or products of this component are directed? For example, does it focus on rural or inner-city youth, the disadvantaged, etc.? If so, please indicate the group or groups.

_____

_____

_____

2.12 To your knowledge, was this most successful component intended in the proposal which was approved for 1969-70 by USOE, to be of major importance?

Yes . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 2.14)*
No . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 2.13)*

2.13 *(If no)* Can you explain how this came to be a major component in your project?

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.14 Do you plan to include this component in your 1970-71 project activity?

Yes . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 2.15)* *(Note response for*
No . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 2.17)* *Q. 3.17, page 12.)*

2.15 *(If yes)* Generally speaking, will this component receive greater emphasis, about the same emphasis, or less emphasis in next year's (1970-71) plans compared with this year's (1969-70)?

Greater emphasis . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 2.16)*
Same emphasis . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 2.18)*
Less emphasis . . . . . 3( ) *(Go to Q. 2.16)*

2.16 *(If greater or less emphasis)* Why?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Go to Q. 2.18.

2.17 *(If no)* Please explain why you are not planning to include this component in next year's activities?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.18 As you think of your present work in _____*(name of component)*, basically what is it that you are trying to accomplish, or what is the major purpose of this specific component, quite aside from what the total project purposes might be. *(Statements of purpose often reflect a change in some condition, behavior, performance or activity over a period of time. They serve as guidelines to achievement (output). They define the parameters of activities relevant to the project and establish priorities among the possible activities which could be undertaken.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.19 Has the purpose of this component changed in any way since it first became included in your project?

It's substantially the same . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 2.21)*
It's somewhat different . . . . . 2( )
It's greatly different . . . . . 3( ) [*Go to Q. 2.20*]

2.20 *(If not substantially the same)* Please indicate how it is different.

_____

_____

_____

_____

2.21 Although you regard _____*(name of component)* as the most successful component of your project, as you reflect upon this past year, how fully do you think the present purpose of it has been achieved? Would you say it has been:

Fully achieved. . . . . 1( )
Substantially achieved. . . . 2( )
Somewhat achieved . . . . . 3( )
Hardly achieved . . . . . 4( )
Not at all achieved . . . . . 5( )

3. INPUTS OF MOST SUCCESSFUL PROJECT COMPONENT

The extent to which the stated purpose of a project component is achieved is dependent in large part upon the adequacy of resources available. These resources may be human, financial, or physical.

3.1 With respect to the central-administrative staff who are most responsible for _____*(name of component)*, how adequate have they been in facilitating the desired purpose of this component? *(Central staff is viewed mainly as the administrators of this component. It may consist of as few as one person or as many as three or four.)* Would you say they have been:

Very adequate . . . . . 1( )
Quite adequate . . . . . 2( )
Somewhat adeq . . . . . 3( )
Barely adequ . . . . . 4( )
Not at all ad ate . . . . 5( )

3.2 What talents in addition to those which members of your central staff possess would have enabled your project to achieve more fully the stated purpose of this component?

_____

_____

_____

3.3 What major factors prevented the acquisition or full utilization of those desired talents? *(Probe: Were there planning considerations, time considerations, financial considerations?)*

_____

_____

_____

3.4 Is there, in addition to the central-administrative staff, an instructional or service staff connected with this component?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 3.5)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 3.8)*

3.5 *(If yes)* In general, how adequate has this staff been in contributing to the achievement of the desired purpose of this component? Would you say it has been:

Very adequate . . . . . 1( )
Quite adequate . . . . . 2( )
Somewhat adequate . . . . . 3( )
Barely adequate . . . . . 4( )
Not at all adequate . . . . . 5( )

3.6 What additional talents of this staff would have helped to achieve more fully the stated purpose of this component?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.7 What major factors detracted from acquiring or fully utilizing these desired talents? *(Probe: Were there planning considerations, time considerations, financial considerations?)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.8 *(If in Q. 2.5, page 5 of this schedule, the respondent answered no, proceed with Q. 3.11. If the respondent answered yes, proceed with:* Earlier you indicated that there were participants involved with this component. To what extent have the participants been of the desired caliber and background to allow you to achieve the stated purpose of this component? *(Read categories.)*

Very much so . . . . . 1( )
For the most part. . . . . 2( )
Partially so . . . . . 3( )
Not at all . . . . . 4( )

3.9 What additional characteristics of the participants would have been most desired to achieve the purpose of this component?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.10 What major factors detracted from acquiring or fully utilizing the desired participant characteristics and talents? *(Probe: Were recruitment, selection, finances, etc., factors?)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.11 Of the major parity groups (that is, community, education, liberal arts and sciences, and schools) how would you rank their actual relative contribution to achieving the purpose of this component? Which group has contributed the most? Which next? Thirdly? The least? *(Assign a "10" to the group which contributed most and "40" to the least. Average out tie rankings.)*

	Actual Rank
Community . . .	_____
Education . . .	_____
L.A.S.	_____
Schools	_____

3.12 What was their intended ranking with respect to achieving the purpose of this component? *(Assign ranks as in Q. 3.11.)*

	Intended Rank
Community	_____
Education	_____
L.A.S.	_____
Schools	_____

3.13 *(If actual and intended rankings are different)* What reasons are there for this difference between the actual and intended? *(Probe: Have the intents changed? Were the intended contributions not realized as was expected?)*

_____

_____

_____

3.14 Quite aside from whether the actual and the intended contributions of these parity groups were the same or not, what have been the major contributions of the group that contributed the most to achieving the purpose of this component? That is, the _____ *(name of group with an actual rank of"10")* group?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.15 With respect to the parity group that actually contributed the least to your achieving the purpose of this component, was it your intent that it should make a contribution? *(If tied with another group, talk only about one. Circle response category in Q. 3.11 to indicate which one was talked about. Respondent should remember that reference is being made to this past year's intent.)*

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 3.16)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 3.17)*

3.16 *(If yes)* What factors prevented it from contributing more?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Go to Q. 3.18.

3.17 *(If no, but component is intended in 1970-71 activities; see Q. 2.14, p. 7; otherwise skip to 3.18.)* What are you doing to increase the likelihood that this parity group will make a greater contribution to achieving next year's purpose of this component?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3.18 Let's shift from the human resources associated with this component to its financial resources. For this past fiscal year, were you funded at least at the same level as requested in your original budget proposal?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 3.22)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 3.19)*

3.19 *(If no)* Was it a severe cut requiring a large adjustment, a moderate cut requiring moderate adjustment, or a small cut requiring little adjustment in your proposed total project activities?

Severe cut . . . . . 1( )
Moderate cut . . . . . 2( )
Small cut . . . . . 3( )

3.20 To what extent did this budget cut affect the proposed activities of the component that we have been talking about? Did it affect it greatly, somewhat, or not at all?

Greatly . . . . . 1( )
Somewhat . . . . . 2( ) [*Go to Q. 3.21*]
Not at all . . . . . 3( ) *(Go to Q. 3.22)*

3.21 *(If greatly or somewhat)* Please indicate the adjustments that had to be made with this component. *(Probe: Did you have to cut back on personnel, student fellowships, etc.?)*

_____

_____

_____

3.22 Quite aside from the amount of funding received, a project can be affected by the timing of the funding. In general, would you say that the funding of your project was earlier than expected, when expected, or later than expected? *(If present director was not in charge at time when question applies, have him estimate.)*

Earlier than expected . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 3.23)*
When expected . . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 3.24)*
Later than expected . . . . . 3( ) *(Go to Q. 3.23)*

3.23 *(If not when expected)* What problems, if any, did this create for the project component we have been talking about? *(Probe: Was it too late to get personnel commitments? Were there organizational problems which resulted because funding was not when expected?)*

_____

_____

_____

3.24 With most federally supported programs such as TTT, the government requires that there be some minimum cost sharing by the institution receiving the grant. Is there such a requirement with regard to your project?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 3.25)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 3.29)*

3.25 *(If yes)* What percent of the total budget is supposed to be provided by your home institution?

_____%

3.26 What percent of the total budget is actually provided by your institution? Give your best estimate.

_____%

(Interviewer subtracts % given for Q. 3.26 from % given for Q. 3.25 and records difference in space provided in Q. 3.27.)

3.27 Then this means your home institution actually provides _____% _____*(indicate "greater" or "less")* than the amount specified by the government as the institution's responsibility?

Yes . . . . 1( )
No . . . . 2( )

3.28 *(If greater than)* What aspects of the project are supported beyond the minimum requirement by local funds? *(Check all that apply.)*

Communications . . . . . 1( )
Employee benefits . . . . . 2( )
Personnel salaries . . . . . 3( )
Travel . . . . . 4( )
Supplies and materials . . . 5( )
Services . . . . . 6( )
Other _____ . 7( )
(specify)

3.29 Are there any sources of support for your project other than the federal government and your home institution?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 3.30)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.)*

3.30 *(If yes)* Identify these sources of support and the percent of the total project support provided by this (these) source(s).

Source	Percent Support
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

4. ACTIVITIES AND OUTCOMES OF MOST SUCCESSFUL PROJECT COMPONENT

Let's now shift our attention from the inputs to the outcomes of this _____*(name of component)*.

4.1 Earlier you indicated that the purpose of this component was _____ *(indicate purpose from Q. 2.18, page 8)*. To the best of your knowledge, did any programs with a similar purpose or focus exist at your institution prior to the funding of your TTT project?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.2)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.3)*

4.2 *(If yes)* Briefly describe any differences in the purpose of the present TTT project component with that of a previous program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.3 Besides differences in purposes that may or may not exist among programs one can speak about various other aspects of a project or a project component such as its organizational structure, communication patterns, staff/participant personnel, curricula, and cooperative arrangements with other units.

As a beginning place, let's talk about organizational dimensions. Does your project have an advisory committee or something similar?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.4)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.12)*

4.4 *(If yes)* Describe the composition (i.e., what groups or professions) of this committee.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.5 Is the composition of the members of this committee what one would typically expect at _____*(indicate place of project)*?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.7)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.6)*

4.6 *(If no)* How does the composition of the committee membership differ from that which typically exists at your home institution?

_____

_____

_____

4.7 What is the advisory committee's primary function?

_____

_____

_____

4.8 Does this advisory committee affect the activities of _____ _____ *(name of component)* that we have been talking about?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.9)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.10)*

4.9 *(If yes)* How does this group affect the activities of the component? For example, does it contribute to action?

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.10 Did setting up the advisory committee result in any policy change in your institution?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.11)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.12)*

4.11 *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the change.

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.12 Let's now consider decision making in _____ *(name of component)*. Is the decision making process of this component shared by groups or individuals other than the administrators of the component?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.13)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.17)*

4.13 *(If yes)* Who shares in the decision making?

_____

_____

_____

4.14 Is such sharing a typical practice or does it represent a change in practice of your institution?

Typical practice . . . . . 1( )
Change in practice . . . . . 2( )

4.15 Did this practice of sharing in decision making require a change in institutional policy?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.16)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.17)*

4.16 *(If yes)* What policy changes took place?

_____

_____

_____

4.17 Now let's talk about those cooperative working arrangements that exist for carrying out the functions of _____*(name of component)*. Has there been an increase in cooperative working arrangements within _____*(name of unit which is primarily responsible for administering this component)*?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.18)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.19)*

4.18 *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the increased arrangements.

_____

_____

_____

4.19 *(Skip to Q. 4.21 if responsible unit is the only one in the institution or agency.)* Has there been an increase in cooperative working arrangements between the unit primarily responsible for administering the project component and other units within your institution or agency?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.20)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.21)*

4.20 *(If yes)* Specify the major units and for each indicate an increased arrangement.

	Unit	Arrangement
a.	_____	_____
	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____
	_____	_____

4.20 (Continued)

c. _____ _____

_____ _____

4.21 Are there any institutions, agencies, or groups outside your home institution with whom cooperative working arrangements have been increased? For example, the schools, a community agency, etc. If so, please list them. *(After interviewee has listed some, probe: Are there any more? If none listed, skip to Q. 4.28.)*

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

f. _____

4.22 Taking them one at a time, beginning with the first one you listed, what increased working arrangements have been made with _____ *(indicate first outside unit [a] listed).*

_____

_____

(If only unit mentioned, skip to Q. 4.28.)

4.23 What arrangements have been increased with _____ *(indicate second outside unit [b] listed).*

_____

_____

_____

(If last unit mentioned, skip to Q. 4.28.)

4.24 And with _____ *(indicate third outside unit [c] listed).*

_____

_____

_____

(If last unit mentioned, skip to Q. 4.28.)

4.25 And what about _____*(indicate fourth outside unit [d] listed)*?

_____

_____

_____

(If last unit mentioned, skip to Q. 4.28.)

4.26 What arrangements have been increased with _____ *(indicate fifth outside unit [e] listed).*

_____

_____

_____

(If last unit listed, skip to Q. 4.28.)

4.27 And with _____*(indicate sixth outside unit [f] listed).*

_____

_____

_____

4.28 Have any of the above mentioned increased cooperative working arrangements resulted in a change of policy in your institution? If so, what has been the nature of the policy change and what units or agencies have been affected by it?

	Policy Change	Unit
a.	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____
	_____	_____
	_____	_____

4.29 In broad terms, to what extent would you estimate the increased cooperative arrangements have changed the units', other than your own, involvement in the training of teachers? Do you view this change as:

Substantial . . . . . 1( )
Quite a bit . . . . . 2( )
Somewhat. . . . . 3( )
A little. . . . . 4( )
Not at all. . . . . 5( )

4.30 Now let's shift to some questions about curriculum. Broadly conceived, curriculum may be defined as any program which has as its purpose the instruction or service of a clientele. Thinking of curriculum in this broad sense, are there any new curricular experiences, degree or non-degree, associated with _____ *(name of component)*?

Only degree . . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.31)*
Only non-degree . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.45)*
Both . . . . . 3( ) *(Go to Q. 4.31)*
None . . . . . 4( ) *(Go to Q. 4.52)*

4.31 *(If only degree or both)* Distinguishing between new and revised curricular experiences, have any new curricular experiences (e.g., courses, internship programs) been designed to facilitate the objectives of this component that can be applied to an advanced degree?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.32)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.37)*

4.32 *(If yes)* Describe or give the titles of each of these new curricular experiences and the level of each (e.g., undergraduate, masters, doctorate).

	Title	Level
a.	_____	_____
	_____	_____
b.	_____	_____
	_____	_____
c.	_____	_____
	_____	_____
d.	_____	_____
	_____	_____

4.32 (Continued)

e. _____ _____

_____ _____

4.33 Are persons who enroll in these curricular experiences typically TTT fellows, regular students, or both?

TTT fellows . . . . . 1( )
Regular students. . . . . 2( )
Both. . . . . 3( )

4.34 Do these new curricular experiences take into consideration the special interests or background of the student beyond that which is typical in courses at your institution?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.35)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.36)*

4.35 *(If yes)* What clientele considerations have been taken into account?

_____

_____

_____

4.36 Who is primarily responsible for providing the leadership for these new curricular experiences, i.e., teaching, coordinating?

TTT Project Staff . . . . . 1( )
Regular Institution Staff . . . 2( )
Other _____. . 3( )
(specify)

4.37 Have any existing curricular experiences which apply to an advanced degree been revised to accomodate this component's objectives?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.38)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.41)*

4.38 *(If yes)* Have the revisions been basically content changes or changes in methods, or both?

Content changes . . . . 1( )
Method changes. . . . . 2( )
Both. . . . . 3( )

4.39 Does the revision take into consideration the special interests or background of the student beyond that which is typical in your courses?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.40)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.41)*

4.40 *(If yes)* What clientele considerations have been taken into account?

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.41 Did any of the curricular changes (new or revised) associated with an advanced degree program require a policy change in your home institution?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.42)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.43)*

4.42 *(If yes)* Briefly indicate the nature of the policy change.

_____

_____

_____

4.43 Did any persons associated with the parity groups in TTT *(community, schools, liberal arts and science, students, education)* play a major role in the design of any of these new or revised offerings?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.44)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.45)*

4.44 *(If yes)* With what parity groups were these persons associated?

_____

_____

4.45 *(If only non-degree or both)* Consider now those curricular experiences new or revised, associated with this project component that are non-degree in nature. Briefly describe or give the titles of these new or revised non-degree curricular experiences. *(Probe: When necessary for type of experience, e.g., conference, discussion group, rap session, consultation, mass media, field activity, etc.)*

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

e. _____

f. _____

g. _____

4.46 In general, for what major groups are these experiences intended? *(Specify the clientele being served.)*

_____

_____

4.47 What unique characteristics, if any, are possessed by those providing the leadership for these non-degree (informal) experiences?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.48 Did any persons associated with the parity groups in TTT play a major role in the design of any of these non-degree offerings?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.49)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.50)*

4.49 *(If yes)* With what parity groups were these persons associated?

_____

_____

_____

4.50 In concluding this section on curricula, have there been any curricular products for consumption by the schools or for the training of teachers associated with this component?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.51)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.52)*

4.51 *(If yes)* Briefly describe any such curricular products.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.52 Switch now to the communications patterns associated with this project component. Would you say that the communications with *(indicate each of the parity groups other than that represented by the director)* has increased? *(Check [√] the group with whom communications has increased.)*

Community . . . . . 1( )
Teacher Education . . . . . 2( )
Liberal Arts and Sciences . . . 3( )
Public Schools. . . . . 4( )
Students. . . . . 5( )

4.53 With which group (other than your own) is communication most frequent?

_____

4.54 Indicate those types of communication most frequently used with representatives of this group.

Face-to-face . . . . 1( )
Telephone. . . . . 2( )
Written. . . . . 3( )

4.55 Who usually initiates the communication?

I do . . . . . 1( )
Both they or me . . . . . 2( )
They do . . . . . 3( )

4.56 What is the substance of the communication, most generally that is? *(Probe: Policy, planning, operations, or evaluation substance.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4.57 Earlier brief mention was made about the desirable staff and student characteristics needed to more fully achieve the purpose of this component. With regard to staff and faculty, have there been joint appointments of faculty across traditional department or unit lines?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.58)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 4.59)*

4.58 *(If yes)* Give a few examples please.

_____

_____

_____

4.59 Have new staff-faculty titles been created as a result of your efforts in achieving the purpose of this component, e.g., clinical associate?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 4.60)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 5.)*

4.60 *(If yes)* What are some titles?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. LEAST SUCCESSFUL PROJECT COMPONENT

At the beginning of this interview you listed the major components of your project. We have talked in detail about the component you considered to be most successful. Now I would like to ask only a few questions about that project component that you considered to be least successful. You indicated earlier that _____ *(See Q. 2.3, page 5 for least successful component)* was in your opinion the least successful component of your project.

5.1 As you look back over this past year's activity associated with this component and you compare the activity with the expectations you had, what were some of the major disappointments or problems encountered? *(Please enumerate [a, b, ...] major problem areas.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.2 Viewing each of these problems one at a time, what factors may have prevented these problems from occurring ? Let's start with the first one you mentioned. *(Continue for each of the problems mentioned in Q. 5.1. Make sure that letters indicating problem and prevention correspond.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.2 (Continued)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5.3 What priority did this component have at the beginning of this past year's project activity? That is, did it have a high, medium, or low priority?

High . . . . . 1( )
Medium . . . . . 2( )
Low . . . . . 3( )

5.4 Does it have a different priority now?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 5.5)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 5.6)*

5.5 *(If yes)* Does it have a higher or lower priority?

Higher . . . . . 1( )
Lower. . . . . 2( )

5.6 Are you expecting to continue this project component as part of next year's (1970-71) project activity?

Yes . . . . 1( )
No . . . . 2( )

6. LTI SITE VISITATION

Now let's spend a little time talking about the LTI site visitation that occurred last November and December. *(If not visited, skip to Q. 7.)*

6.1 What do you feel was the major purpose(s) of this visit? *(Probe as to making a judgment about the project for refunding, to assist project, to evaluate, to describe project, etc.)*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

6.2 How much impact did this visit have on your project?

Great impact . . . . . 1( )
Much impact. . . . . 2( )
Some impact. . . . . 3( )
Little impact. . . . . 4( )
No impact. . . . . 5( )

6.3 What did your project gain as a result of the visit?

_____

_____

_____

6.4 Have you read the group report made by the visitation team about your project?

Yes . . . . 1( ) *(Go to Q. 6.5)*
No . . . . 2( ) *(Go to Q. 6.9)*

6.5 *(If yes)* Is it an accurate description?

Yes . . . . 1( )
No . . . . 2( )

6.6 Is it fair?

Yes . . . . 1( )
No . . . . 2( )

6.7 Is the information of any use to you?

Yes . . . . 1( )
No . . . . 2( )

6.8 Has it made a difference in what you have been doing?

Yes . . . . 1( )
No . . . . 2( )

6.9 Now that a second site visit has, for the most part been completed, what advice would you have for the conduct of this visitation?

7. A FINAL WORD

Finally, if you had two or three comments to convey anonymously to the administrators of the National TTT Program about any aspect of TTT, what would you like to let them know. *(Record anything they want to blow their mind about.)*

That completes our interview. Let me say that we at CIRCE appreciate your help. Our evaluation will be the better because of it. Thank you. Goodbye.

APPENDIX B: Interviewee Roster

INTERVIEWEE ROSTER
1969-70 TTT Project Director Phone Interview

Interviewee	Institution	Location
William J. Brown	Wesleyan University	Hartford, Connecticut
Kenneth Cadenhead	Auburn University	Auburn, Alabama
D. K. Clear	University of Wisconsin	Milwaukee, Wisconsin
Moses Davis	Colorado Commission on Higher Education	Denver, Colorado
William Drummond	Washington State Dept. of Public Instruction	Olympia, Washington
Verne Faust	University of Miami	Miami, Florida
G. W. Ford	San Jose State College	San Jose, California
Richard B. Ford	Clark University	Worcester, Massachusetts
Jack Guthrie	University of Pittsburgh	Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
A. H. Haas	Harvard University	Cambridge, Massachusetts
William Hawley	Michigan State University	East Lansing, Michigan
William Hazard	Northwestern University	Evanston, Illinois
John Higgins	University of South Florida	Tampa, Florida
John Jarolimek	University of Washington	Seattle, Washington
J. B. Jones	Texas Southern University	Houston, Texas
A. Guy Larkins	Washington University	St. Louis, Missouri
Myron Lieberman	City University of New York	New York, New York
George Manolakes	New York University	New York, New York
Fred M. Newmann	University of Wisconsin	Madison, Wisconsin
Paul A. Olson	University of Nebraska	Lincoln, Nebraska
D. T. Oviatt	San Fernando Valley State College	Northridge, California
Vito Perrone	University of North Dakota	Grand Forks, North Dakota
Walter T. Petty	State University of New York	Buffalo, New York
Roy A. Price	Syracuse University	Syracuse, New York
Donald Robinson	Southern Illinois University	Carbondale, Illinois
Jesse Rudnick	Temple University	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Joseph Sales	Wayne State University	Detroit, Michigan
Eugene Slaughter	Southeastern State College	Durant, Oklahoma
Gerald R. Smith	Indiana University	Bloomington, Indiana
Madelon Stent	Fordham University	New York, New York
Elizabeth Titsworth	STEP	San Francisco, California
Vincent I. West	University of Illinois	Urbana, Illinois
Samuel Wiggins	Cleveland State University	Cleveland, Ohio
David E. Willis	Portland State University	Portland, Oregon
Arthur E. Wise	University of Chicago	Chicago, Illinois
J. Zeb Wright	West Virginia State Department of Education	Charleston, West Virginia
James A. Yonts	George Peabody College	Nashville, Tennessee